

Dear Committee Members,

10 years ago, I had a car accident. Before the accident, I could drive, use the bathroom, raise my kids, go to sporting events, cook, and take care of myself. The second after the accident, I could no longer drive, could not empty my bladder or bowels without manual assistance from a caregiver, or transfer from a bed to a wheelchair. I could not cook, shower, or take care of my kids. Since the accident, I require 24 a day care. I am here to object to the bill's failure to prevent retroactive imposition of attendant cap restrictions, and the workers comp fee schedule. There is no economic rationale for punishing those disabled persons who have already filed justifiable claims. At the very least, we need to be grandfathered.

I paid a fair premium for my car insurance. It was a higher premium because Michigan law had no attendant hours limitations. State Farm, my insurance carrier, thought it was a fair deal. They accepted Michigan's rules, the premium I paid, and did not leave the State of Michigan. The proposed law seeks to go back on basic contract rights and ask me to retroactively subsidize State Farm on a deal that they and I considered a fair handshake.

The retroactive provisions are not only unfair, but will not alter the future pricing of State Farm's policies. Any legislator who does not know this has never taken the first week of principles of economics. Sunk costs are sunk. I cannot believe that a pro-business legislature would violate this most sacred tenet of contract law by imposing retroactive provisions. The uncertainty generated by this precedent will traumatize business and those who do business with Michigan businesses. Who wants to enter into contracts with businesses in a state that retroactively undoes those contracts.

The retroactive provisions of the bill simply amount to a transfer of wealth from the most desperate, destitute, and disabled state residents to national insurance companies. These companies can walk away from the state at any time. Can these retroactive provisions be motivated by anything other than payments by the insurance companies to your campaigns or threats to fund your opponents? If you are insulted by that comment, prove it by abstaining from voting on the bill if you have taken or plan to take contributions from the insurance

industry. There is no economic motivation that would prevent you from grandfathering in those whose claims were generated by prior accidents.

The bill also simply tosses me into a nursing home and onto Medicaid. They have no space in nursing homes and Michigan's Medicaid plan is nearly bankrupt. I know that a nursing home would cost over \$100,000 per year, about \$3 million for the rest of my expected life. Almost surely, the taxpayers of the state of Michigan rather than an insurance company that has reserves for my claim, will end up paying for me. Again that insurance company fairly agreed to take my premiums in exchange for the coverage that generated my claim. This means the taxpayers of Michigan will simply transfer their wealth to out of state insurance giants. Removing 40% of past promised claims from the insurance giants will not affect the price of insurance one iota, but it will bankrupt the great state of Michigan.

If you want that bankruptcy burden on your conscience and that burden on your kids, go ahead and vote for the bill—it is my life you have in your hands but it is your conscience. Shame on you either for stupidity or duplicity if you vote for this bill.